



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,848	03/10/2004	Souk-Joung Joon	8836-230 (IB12296-US)	5659
22150 7590 01/27/2009 F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC 130 WOODBURY ROAD WOODBURY, NY 11797				
EXAMINER				
FINDLEY, CHRISTOPHER G				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2621				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/27/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/797,848

**Applicant(s)**

JOON ET AL.

**Examiner**

CHRISTOPHER FINDLEY

**Art Unit**

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/30/2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/ISD)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/27/2008

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12/10/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Re claim 1, the Applicant contends that Hibi requires multiple thresholds, and, therefore, Hibi fails to support the "single threshold" claimed. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. While Hibi discloses six thresholds, three of which are used for comparison of each block depending on which branch of Fig. 5 the processing follows, each threshold type (i.e., V, S, or C) is employed for comparison to different types of values. The language presented in claim 1 provides for comparing a sum of absolute differences with a single threshold. Fig. 5 of Hibi shows that depending on the state of the system, the processing either follows a first branch (including steps S7, S8, and S10) or a second branch (including steps S14, S15, and S17) for each block. Accordingly, a differential sum of squares is compared to either threshold S1 or S2 (Hibi: Fig. 5, steps S8 and S15). Since a block does not pass through both branches of the flow chart illustrated in Fig. 5, the differential sum of squares value is only compared to one of S1 and S2, thus comparing the differential sum of squares value for each block to a single threshold. Hibi also discloses that threshold values S1 and S2 may be the same (Hibi: paragraph [0177]).
3. Re claim 1, the Applicant also contends that it is unclear whether the thresholds are determined during production of a system for a particular application, or whether such thresholds are user-selectable. While Hibi does not explicitly state that the

thresholds are user-selectable, support exists within Hibi for inferring user-selection. Hibi discloses that the user may control the detection periods T1 and T2 (Hibi: paragraphs [0093], [0096], and [0097]), wherein T1 and T2 are "set at will according to the intended use or purpose" of the system (Hibi: paragraph [0154]), thus indicating that the user determines the intended use or purpose of the system and sets the system parameters accordingly. Hibi discloses that threshold values V1, S1, C1, V2, S2, and C2 are also set "according to the intended use or purpose" of the system (Hibi: paragraph [0177]). Hibi further discloses that recording is started upon user activation (Hibi: paragraph [0091]) and manipulating difference thresholds S1 and S2 in order to control starting and stopping of recording (Hibi: paragraphs [0218] and [0220]-[0223]). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious that since the user determines the intended use or purpose of the system and controls the start of the recording operation and the detection periods, the user would also control the S1 and S2 thresholds in order to consequently control the detecting operation, and thus the stopping of the recording operation.

4. Re claim 1, the Applicant also contends that the selection of six inter-related thresholds would require that the user have expert-level knowledge of such security systems, which requirement is inapposite to the Applicants' video mobile phone designed for personal use by a layperson.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., that the user be a layperson) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the

claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's argument that the claimed invention is intended for use by a layperson, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

5. Re claim 1, the Applicant further contends that none of Hibi's thresholds corresponds to Applicants' presently claimed "sum of absolute values of differences between the pixel luminance of a current video frame and the pixel luminances of a stored arbitrary video frame." However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Hibi discloses that although a sum of squared difference is shown in steps S5 and S8 of Fig. 5, a feature amount, other than the sum of squared difference, that expresses a sum total of differences of pixel values within a block or energy between a block of the target picture plane and a block of the reference picture plane can be utilized such as a sum of absolute differential values (Hibi: paragraph [0173]). Hibi further discloses using differences in color and brightness, not detected with a motion vector, between picture planes as a change metric (Hibi: paragraph [0217]), wherein brightness is another name for luminance, as is well known in the art.

6. Regarding Applicants' remarks disputing the reliance upon Malone et al. (US Pre-Grant Publication Number 2006/0115111 A1), which claims the priority date of

parent US Patent Number 6,996,251, which in turn claims priority to provisional application 60/414,449, the Examiner has reviewed the disclosure of said provisional application and verified that said provisional application supports the portions of the referenced disclosure relied upon by the Examiner. Furthermore, the Applicants' perfected priority date is 3/28/2003, whereas the above noted provisional application was filed on 9/30/2002.

7. Re claim 1, the Applicant contends that Malone has neither an alarm generator in cellular signal communication with the phone nor an alarm video storage device in cellular communication with the phone. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Hibi discloses a security system comprising: a camera having a security function (Hibi: paragraphs [0039]-[0040], the intruder detection indicates a security function) for capturing external images (Hibi: paragraph [0035]), determining changes from previous external images, and transmitting alarm control signals and alarm video frames responsive to the determined changes (Hibi: Fig. 5); an alarm generator in signal communication with the video mobile phone for receiving the alarm control signals from the video mobile phone and generating an alarm (Hibi: paragraphs [0080] and [0084]); and an alarm video storage device in signal communication with the video mobile phone for receiving and storing the alarm video frames transmitted from the video mobile phone (Hibi: Fig. 1, storage medium 18). Hibi

does not specifically disclose that a video mobile phone is used for capturing input images to be stored on the storage medium, or that communication is conducted over a cellular telephone network. However, Malone discloses an apparatus for capturing information as a file and enhancing the file with embedded information, in which the capture device may be a cell phone that has a camera (Malone: paragraph [0018] and Fig. 1, capture device 102). Malone also discloses that the system incorporates a cellular telephone network (Malone: paragraph [0020]). Since both Hibi and Malone relate to capturing video and processing the captured video to be stored on a storage medium, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to combine the wireless functionality and certification procedure of Malone with the image processing apparatus of Hibi in order to improve the versatility (i.e., portability) and strengthen the fortitude of the security function of Hibi by utilizing a smaller camera which can transmit encrypted data to a remote storage facility (Malone: paragraph [0008]). Therefore, the combined system of Hibi and Malone teaches the features of claim 1.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**9. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hibi et al. (US 20020006163 A1) in view of Malone et al. (US 20060115111 A1).**

Re claim 1, Hibi discloses a security system comprising: a camera having a security function (Hibi: paragraphs [0039]-[0040], the intruder detection indicates a security function) for capturing external images (Hibi: paragraph [0035]), determining changes from previous external images, and transmitting alarm control signals and alarm video frames responsive to the determined changes (Hibi: Fig. 5); an alarm generator in signal communication with the video mobile phone for receiving the alarm control signals from the video mobile phone and generating an alarm (Hibi: paragraphs [0080] and [0084]); and an alarm video storage device in signal communication with the video mobile phone for receiving and storing the alarm video frames transmitted from the video mobile phone (Hibi: Fig. 1, storage medium 18), wherein the changes are determined by computing a sum of absolute values of differences between the pixel luminances of a current video frame and the pixel luminances of a stored arbitrary video frame, and comparing the sum with a single threshold (Hibi: Fig. 5, steps S8 and S15, each block passes through only one branch of the flow chart, so the differential sum of squares value is only compared to one of S1 and S2, thus comparing the differential sum of squares value for each block to a single threshold; paragraph [0173], although a sum of squared difference is shown in steps S5 and S8 of Fig. 5, a feature amount, other than the sum of squared difference, that expresses a sum total of differences of pixel values within a block or energy between a block of the target picture plane and a block of the reference picture plane can be utilized such as a sum of absolute



differential values; paragraph [0217], using differences in color and brightness between picture planes as a change metric, wherein brightness is another name for luminance, as is well known in the art).

Hibi does not specifically disclose that a video mobile phone is used for capturing input images to be stored on the storage medium, or that communication is conducted over a cellular telephone network. However, Malone discloses an apparatus for capturing information as a file and enhancing the file with embedded information, in which the capture device may be a cell phone that has a camera (Malone: paragraph [0018] and Fig. 1, capture device 102). Malone also discloses that the system incorporates a cellular telephone network (Malone: paragraph [0020]). Since both Hibi and Malone relate to capturing video and processing the captured video to be stored on a storage medium, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to combine the wireless functionality and certification procedure of Malone with the image processing apparatus of Hibi in order to improve the versatility (i.e., portability) and strengthen the fortitude of the security function of Hibi by utilizing a smaller camera which can transmit encrypted data to a remote storage facility (Malone: paragraph [0008]).

While Hibi does not explicitly state that the thresholds are user-selectable, support exists within Hibi for inferring user-selection. Hibi discloses that the user may control the detection periods T1 and T2 (Hibi: paragraphs [0093], [0096], and [0097]), wherein T1 and T2 are "set at will according to the intended use or purpose" of the system (Hibi: paragraph [0154]), thus indicating that the user determines the intended

use or purpose of the system and sets the system parameters accordingly. Hibi discloses that threshold values V1, S1, C1, V2, S2, and C2 are also set "according to the intended use or purpose" of the system (Hibi: paragraph [0177]). Hibi further discloses that recording is started upon user activation (Hibi: paragraph [0091]) and manipulating difference thresholds S1 and S2 in order to control starting and stopping of recording (Hibi: paragraphs [0218] and [0220]-[0223]). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious that since the user determines the intended use or purpose of the system and controls the start of the recording operation and the detection periods, the user would also control the S1 and S2 thresholds in order to consequently control the detecting operation, and thus the stopping of the recording operation.

Re **claim 2**, the combined system of Hibi and Malone discloses that the video mobile phone comprises: a video input device for capturing and inputting external images into the video mobile phone (Malone: paragraph [0018]); a video processor for comparing video frames inputted from the video input device to generate result values and compressing the alarm video frames according to control signals (Hibi: Fig. 1, the Motion Picture Coding Portion 12 is controlled by the Operation Control Portion 14, which is influenced by the Change Detection Portion 13); and an alarm controller for generating control signals to control the alarm according to the result values generated by the video processor (Hibi: Fig. 1, Operation Control Portion 14).

Re **claim 3**, the combined system of Hibi and Malone discloses that the video processor comprises: a video storage device for storing at least one of captured video

frames inputted from the video input device and sampled video frames (Malone: Fig. 1, secure storage facility 138); a video comparator for comparing the video frames stored in the video storage device to generate result values (Hibi: paragraph [0173]; Fig. 1, Change Detecting Portion 13 compares target frame with reference frame); and a video converter for compressing (Hibi: Fig. 1, Motion Picture Coding Portion 12) and transmitting (Malone: Fig. 1, Tx 134) the video frames according to control signals from the alarm generator (Hibi: Fig. 1, recording control portion 17 determines whether to store video in the storage medium).

**Re claim 4**, the combined system of Hibi and Malone discloses that the video comparator compares the sum of absolute values of differences between the pixel luminance of a current video frame and the pixel luminance of a stored arbitrary video frame with a threshold value defined by an user, thereby generating result values (Hibi: Fig. 5; paragraphs [0173] and [0176]-[0177]).

**Re claim 5**, the combined system of Hibi and Malone discloses that the video processor comprises: a video converter for converting the inputted video to generate alarm video according to control signals from an alarm controller and decoding the converted video frames (Hibi: Fig. 1, Motion Picture Coding Portion 12); a compressed video generator for generating compressed video with video signals generated during decoding by the video converter (Hibi: Fig. 1, Motion Picture Coding Portion 12); and a video comparator for comparing the compressed video to generate the result values (Hibi: Change Detecting Portion 13).

Re **claim 6**, the combined system of Hibi and Malone discloses that the compressed video is produced with a DC coefficient selected from the decoding and a motion vector (Malone: [0022], MPEG uses motion vectors for motion estimation and compensation as well as Discrete Cosine Transforms, which generate a DC coefficient).

Re **claim 7**, the combined system of Hibi and Malone discloses that the video comparator compares the sum of absolute values of differences between the pixel luminance of a current video frame and the pixel luminance of a stored arbitrary video frame with a threshold value defined by an user, thereby generating result values (Hibi: paragraphs [0173] and [0176]-[0177]).

Re **claim 8**, the combined system of Hibi and Malone discloses a security system utilizing a method of securing using a capture device having a securing function (Hibi: paragraphs [0039]-[0040], the intruder detection indicates a security function), comprising the steps of: a) setting a security mode (Hibi: paragraphs [0039]-[0040]) and a single threshold value (Hibi: Fig. 5, steps S8 and S15, each block passes through only one branch of the flow chart, so the differential sum of squares value is only compared to one of S1 and S2, thus comparing the differential sum of squares value for each block to a single threshold; paragraph [0173], although a sum of squared difference is shown in steps S5 and S8 of Fig. 5, a feature amount, other than the sum of squared difference, that expresses a sum total of differences of pixel values within a block or energy between a block of the target picture plane and a block of the reference picture plane can be utilized such as a sum of absolute differential values; paragraph [0217], using differences in color and brightness between picture planes as a change metric,

wherein brightness is another name for luminance, as is well known in the art) with the securing function as a basis for determining whether there is motion relative to the video mobile phone (Hibi: paragraph [0173]); b) inputting external images captured with a camera of the video mobile phone into the video mobile phone in the set security mode (Hibi: Fig. 1, camera portion 11); c) processing video frames for at least one of compressing (Hibi: Fig. 1, Motion Picture Coding Portion 12) and storing the inputted video frames (Hibi: Fig. 1, Recording Control Portion 17) and comparing the video frames to generate result values (Hibi: Fig. 5); d) automatically signaling an alarm (Hibi: paragraph [0084]) according to a result of comparing the video frame (Hibi: paragraphs [0085]-[0090]); and f) automatically recording the alarm video frames inputted to the capture device (Hibi: Fig. 3, automatically recording), wherein determining whether there is motion comprises computing a sum of absolute values of differences between the pixel luminances of a current video frame and the pixel luminances of a stored arbitrary video frame, and comparing the sum with the single threshold value (Hibi: Fig. 5, steps S8 and S15, each block passes through only one branch of the flow chart, so the differential sum of squares value is only compared to one of S1 and S2, thus comparing the differential sum of squares value for each block to a single threshold; paragraph [0173], although a sum of squared difference is shown in steps S5 and S8 of Fig. 5, a feature amount, other than the sum of squared difference, that expresses a sum total of differences of pixel values within a block or energy between a block of the target picture plane and a block of the reference picture plane can be utilized such as a sum of absolute differential values; paragraph [0217], using differences in color and

brightness between picture planes as a change metric, wherein brightness is another name for luminance, as is well known in the art).

Hibi does not specifically disclose that the capture device is a video mobile phone, nor an alarm video storage device in cellular signal communication with the video mobile phone. However, Malone discloses an apparatus for capturing information as a file and enhancing the file with embedded information, in which the capture device may be a cell phone that has a camera (Malone: paragraph [0018], "The capture device 102 could be a cell phone that has a video camera..."; Fig. 1, capture device 102). Malone also discloses that the system incorporates a cellular telephone network (Malone: paragraph [0020]), wherein the network is connected to a secure video storage facility (Malone: Fig. 1, secure storage facility 138). Since both Hibi and Malone relate to capturing video and processing the captured video to be stored on a storage medium, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to combine the wireless functionality and certification procedure of Malone with the image processing apparatus of Hibi in order to improve the versatility (i.e., portability) and strengthen the fortitude of the security function of Hibi by utilizing a smaller camera which can transmit encrypted data to a remote storage facility (Malone: paragraph [0008]).

While Hibi does not explicitly state that the thresholds are user-selectable, support exists within Hibi for inferring user-selection. Hibi discloses that the user may control the detection periods T1 and T2 (Hibi: paragraphs [0093], [0096], and [0097]), wherein T1 and T2 are "set at will according to the intended use or purpose" of the

system (Hibi: paragraph [0154]), thus indicating that the user determines the intended use or purpose of the system and sets the system parameters accordingly. Hibi discloses that threshold values V1, S1, C1, V2, S2, and C2 are also set "according to the intended use or purpose" of the system (Hibi: paragraph [0177]). Hibi further discloses that recording is started upon user activation (Hibi: paragraph [0091]) and manipulating difference thresholds S1 and S2 in order to control starting and stopping of recording (Hibi: paragraphs [0218] and [0220]-[0223]). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious that since the user determines the intended use or purpose of the system and controls the start of the recording operation and the detection periods, the user would also control the S1 and S2 thresholds in order to consequently control the detecting operation, and thus the stopping of the recording operation.

**Claim 9** has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 4 above.

Re **claim 10**, the combined system of Hibi and Malone discloses that the video frames are originally captured images (Hibi: Fig. 1, camera portion 11 is attached to the Motion Picture Coding Portion 12 as the input for motion picture data).

Re **claim 11**, the combined system of Hibi and Malone discloses a majority of the features of claim 11, as discussed above in claims 8 and 9, but does not specifically disclose that the video frames are image frames obtained by sampling originally captured images. However, The Examiner takes Official Notice that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to sample the

image frames in order to reduce the amount of image data, thus reducing the amount of processing required for comparing images and the amount of bandwidth required for transmitting images.

Re **claim 12**, the combined system of Hibi and Malone discloses that the video frames are image frames compressed from originally captured images (Hibi: paragraph [0035], images captured by the camera).

Re **claim 13** the combined system of Hibi and Malone discloses a security system comprising: capture device having a security function for capturing external images (Hibi: paragraph [0035]) and determining changes from previous external images (Hibi: paragraph [0217], using differences in color and brightness between picture planes as a change metric, wherein brightness is another name for luminance, as is well known in the art); and an alarm generator in signal communication with the capture device (Hibi: paragraphs [0080] and [0084]), wherein determining changes comprises computing a sum of absolute values of differences between the pixel luminances of a current video frame and the pixel luminances of a stored arbitrary video frame (Hibi: Fig. 5, steps S8 and S15; paragraph [0173], although a sum of squared difference is shown in steps S5 and S8 of Fig. 5, a feature amount, other than the sum of squared difference, that expresses a sum total of differences of pixel values within a block or energy between a block of the target picture plane and a block of the reference picture plane can be utilized such as a sum of absolute differential values; paragraph [0217], using differences in color and brightness between picture planes as a change metric, wherein brightness is another name for luminance, as is well known in the art),



and comparing the sum with a single threshold value (Hibi: Fig. 5, steps S8 and S15, each block passes through only one branch of the flow chart, so the differential sum of squares value is only compared to one of S1 and S2, thus comparing the differential sum of squares value for each block to a single threshold).

Hibi does not specifically disclose that the capture device is a video mobile phone, nor an alarm video storage device in cellular signal communication with the video mobile phone. However, Malone discloses an apparatus for capturing information as a file and enhancing the file with embedded information, in which the capture device may be a cell phone that has a camera (Malone: paragraph [0018], "The capture device 102 could be a cell phone that has a video camera..."; Fig. 1, capture device 102). Malone also discloses that the system incorporates a cellular telephone network (Malone: paragraph [0020]), wherein the network is connected to a secure video storage facility (Malone: Fig. 1, secure storage facility 138). Since both Hibi and Malone relate to capturing video and processing the captured video to be stored on a storage medium, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to combine the wireless functionality and certification procedure of Malone with the image processing apparatus of Hibi in order to improve the versatility (i.e., portability) and strengthen the fortitude of the security function of Hibi by utilizing a smaller camera which can transmit encrypted data to a remote storage facility (Malone: paragraph [0008]).

While Hibi does not explicitly state that the thresholds are user-selectable, support exists within Hibi for inferring user-selection. Hibi discloses that the user may

control the detection periods T1 and T2 (Hibi: paragraphs [0093], [0096], and [0097]), wherein T1 and T2 are “set at will according to the intended use or purpose” of the system (Hibi: paragraph [0154]), thus indicating that the user determines the intended use or purpose of the system and sets the system parameters accordingly. Hibi discloses that threshold values V1, S1, C1, V2, S2, and C2 are also set “according to the intended use or purpose” of the system (Hibi: paragraph [0177]). Hibi further discloses that recording is started upon user activation (Hibi: paragraph [0091]) and manipulating difference thresholds S1 and S2 in order to control starting and stopping of recording (Hibi: paragraphs [0218] and [0220]-[0223]). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious that since the user determines the intended use or purpose of the system and controls the start of the recording operation and the detection periods, the user would also control the S1 and S2 thresholds in order to consequently control the detecting operation, and thus the stopping of the recording operation.

Re **claim 14**, arguments analogous to those presented in claim 8 are applicable to claim 8, and, therefore, claim 14 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 8 above.

Re **claim 15**, arguments analogous to those presented in claim 2 are applicable to claim 15, and, therefore, claim 15 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 2 above.

Re **claim 16**, the combined system of Hibi and Malone discloses first and second input terminals (Hibi: Fig. 1, Motion Picture Coding Portion 12 may switch between two different inputs); a video converter in signal communication with the first and second input terminals (Hibi: Motion Picture Coding Portion 12); a video storage device in signal communication with at least one of the first and second input terminals (Hibi: Fig. 1, storage medium 18); and a video comparator in signal communication with the video storage device (Hibi: Fig. 1, Change detecting portion 13).

Re **claim 17**, the combined system of Hibi and Malone discloses the use of MPEG compression (Malone: paragraph [0022]), which must use a processing apparatus that includes a variable length decoder, a motion compensator, an inverse quantization unit, an inverse discrete cosine transformer, and a summing unit for decoding the compressed video.

Re **claim 18**, the combined system of Hibi and Malone discloses a video converter (Hibi: Fig. 1, Motion Picture Coding Portion 12); a compressed video generator in signal communication with the video converter (Hibi: Fig. 1, Motion Picture Coding Portion 12); and a video comparator in signal communication with the compressed video generator (Hibi: Fig. 1, Change detecting portion 13).

**Claim 19** has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 17 above.

Re **claim 20**, the combined system of Hibi and Malone discloses the use of MPEG compression (Malone: paragraph [0022]), which must use a processing apparatus that includes a variable length decoder and inverse quantization unit.

***Conclusion***

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- a. Portable videophone unit

Saburi (US 20030085990 A1)

- b. Videophone system for scrutiny monitoring with computer control

Katz (US 20060209178 A1)

- c. Subject tracking apparatus

Sakamoto et al. (US 5559551 A)

- d. Electronic and structural components of an intelligent video information management apparatus

Smith et al. (US 5822542 A)

- e. Multimedia surveillance and monitoring system including network configuration

Monroe (US 6970183 B1)

***Contact***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER FINDLEY whose telephone number is (571)270-1199. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30 AM-5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on 571-272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marsha D. Banks-Harold/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621  
/Christopher Findley/